



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,182	12/05/2001	Tal Cohen	COHEN2 (11588.111436)	6925
6980	7590	03/07/2007	EXAMINER	
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP 600 PEACHTREE STREET , NE ATLANTA, GA 30308			PESIN, BORIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/005,182	COHEN ET AL.
	Examiner Boris Pesin	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3-7,21-23,30,31,64 and 75-93 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3-7, 21-23, 30-31, 64, and 75-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 12/29/2006.

Claims 3-7, 21-23, 30-31, 64, and 75-93 are pending in this application. Claims 3 and 64 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 12/29/2006, Claim 64 was amended. This action is made Non-Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3-7, 21-23, 30-31, 64, and 75-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leshem et al. (US 2002/0147805) in view of Harel (US 6064381).

In regards to claim 3, Leshem teaches a computer-implemented method for displaying patterns of utilization of a resource, wherein said resource includes a plurality of objects of interest, and wherein the plurality of objects of interest are linked by a navigation structure (See Figure 1), the method comprising the step of:

Accessing structural data regarding the navigation structure of the objects of interest in a resource (See Figure 1, shows the navigation structure);

Accessing session data representative of one or more sessions of user interaction with the resource where a session identifies a sequence of user accesses to one or more of said plurality of objects of interest, wherein at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence (See Paragraphs [0210] and [0213]);

Graphically displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigation structure, overlaid with a representation of the paths taken in the user accesses to perform the task (See Paragraphs [0215] and [0102]).

Leshem does not specifically teach defining a task sequence as a predetermined sequence of accesses to one or more objects of interest of said plurality of objects of interest and filtering the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses to include only a set of sessions based on the filter criteria by comparing the task sequence to the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses.

Harel teaches defining a task sequence as a predetermined sequence of accesses to one or more objects of interest of said plurality of objects of interest and filtering the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses to include only a set of sessions based on the filter criteria by comparing the task sequence to the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses (See Column 7 Lines 20-43 and Column 8, Lines 13-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Leshem with the teachings of Harel and include a method to defining a task sequence as a predetermined sequence of accesses to one or more objects of interest with the motivation of provide the system designer information about usability problems.

In regards to claim 4, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 3. They further teach a method wherein an object of interest is a web-page (See Abstract).

In regards to claim 5, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 3. They further teach a method wherein said resource is a web-site (See Abstract).

In regards to claim 6, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 3. They further teach a method wherein the step of defining a task as a predetermined sequence to accesses to one or more objects of interest, comprises:

defining a task step as an access to one or more objects of interest; and defining a task as a predetermined sequence of task steps (Harel, Column 7 Lines 20-43 and Column 8, Lines 13-27).

In regards to claim 7, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 6. They further teach a method wherein the overlaid representation of the paths taken show the

number of users that completed each step of the task (Leshem, See Paragraphs [0215] and [0102]).

In regards to claim 21, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 6. They further teach a method comprising the step of: providing a graphical user interface for implementing the step of defining a task as a predetermined sequence of accesses to one or more objects (Harel, Column 7 Lines 20-43 and Column 8, Lines 13-27).

In regards to claim 22, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 21. They further teach a method wherein said graphical user interface enables a user to drag and drop objects of interest into a graphical representation of the task sequence (Harel, Column 7 Lines 20-43 and Column 8, Lines 13-27).

In regards to claim 23, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 21. They further teach a method wherein said graphical user interface enables objects of interest in a task sequence to be defined using a table-based list selection interface (Harel, Column 7 Lines 20-43 and Column 8, Lines 13-27).

In regards to claim 30, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 6. They further teach a method wherein the overlaid representation of the paths taken in the user accesses is a user path for one or more users (See Paragraphs [0215] and [0102]).

In regards to claim 31, Leshem and Harel teach all the limitations of claim 31. They further teach a method wherein the overlaid representation of the paths taken in the user accesses is an average path for a plurality of users through the task steps in the task sequence (See Paragraphs [0215] and [0102]).

In regards to claim 64, Leshem teaches a computer-implemented method for displaying patterns of utilizations of a resource, wherein said resource includes a plurality of objects of interest, and wherein the plurality of objects of interest are linked by a navigation structure (See Figure 1), the method comprising the step of:

accessing structural data regarding the navigation structure of the objects of interest in a resource (See Figure 1);

accessing session data representative of one or more sessions of user interaction with the resource where a session identifies a sequence of user accesses to said one or more of said plurality of objects of interest, wherein at least one of the user accesses is to an object of interest that is not in the task sequence(See Paragraphs [0210] and [0213]);

filtering the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses to include only a set of sessions based on the filter criteria (See Paragraphs [0009], [0215] and [0102]);

graphically displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigation structure, overlaid with a representation of the filtered usage data (See Paragraphs [0009], [0215] and [0102]).

Leshem does not specifically teach defining a task sequence as a predetermined sequence of accesses to one or more objects of interest of said plurality of objects of interest and filtering the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses

to include only a set of sessions based on the filter criteria by comparing the task sequence to the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses.

Harel teaches defining a task sequence as a predetermined sequence of accesses to one or more objects of interest of said plurality of objects of interest and filtering the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses to include only a set of sessions based on the filter criteria by comparing the task sequence to the data representative of one or more sequences of user accesses (See Column 7 Lines 20-43 and Column 8, Lines 13-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Leshem with the teachings of Harel and include a method to defining a task sequence as a predetermined sequence of accesses to one or more objects of interest with the motivation of provide the system designer information about usability problems.

In regards to claim 75, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that spent at least a particular amount of time on any one object of interest (See Paragraphs [0009], [0215] and [0102]).

In regards to claim 76, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that spend at most a particular amount of time on each of the objects of interest in a session (See Paragraphs [0009], [0215] and [0102]).

In regards to claim 77, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that started the session at a particular entry object of interest (See Abstract, Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0102]).

In regards to claim 78, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that ended the session at a particular entry object of interest (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0199]).

In regards to claim 79, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that came to the resource from a particular referring resource (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 80, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions that had a minimum number of user accesses (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 81, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions that had a maximum number of user accesses (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 82, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions that included user accesses to a set of one or more particular objects of interest (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 83, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions that included no user accesses to a set of one or more particular objects of interest (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 84, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that had only one session using the resource in a given period of time (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 85, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that had more than one session using the resource in a given period of time (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 86, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that originate from a particular geographic region (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 87, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions for users that interacted with the web site using and particular web browser type (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 88, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the filter criteria identifies sessions that included a specific sequence of user accesses (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 89, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the step of graphical displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigation structure, overlaid with a representation of the filtered session usage data sizes the objects of interest based on a parameter of the usage of each object (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 90, Leshem-Harel further teaches a method wherein the parameter of usage is representative of the number of users that accessed the objects of interest (See Paragraphs [0009], [0211] and [0200]).

In regards to claim 91, Leshem-Harel teaches a method wherein the parameter of usage is representative of the percentage of users that accessed the objects of interest (See Paragraphs [0213]).

In regards to claim 92, Leshem-Harel teaches a method wherein the step of graphical displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigation structure, overlaid with a representation of the filtered session usage data colors and sizes the links between the objects of interest based on the amount of usage of each link between two objects (See Paragraphs [0213]).

In regards to claim 93, Leshem-Harel teaches a method wherein the step of graphical displaying a hierarchical representation of objects of interest and their navigation structure, overlaid with a representation of the filtered session usage data shows the links between objects of interest based on the amount of usage of each link in a path between two objects (See Paragraphs [0213]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-7, 21-23, 30-31, 64, and 75-93 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100